

METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR DYNAMIC RULE AND/OR OFFER GENERATION

This application claims the benefit of U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 60/248,234, entitled DYNAMIC RULE AND / OR OFFER GENERATION IN A NETWORK OF POINT-OF-SALE TERMINALS, the entire contents of which are incorporated herein by reference as part of the present disclosure.

CROSS-REFERENCE TO RELATED APPLICATIONS

This application is related to: U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/052,093 entitled "Vending Machine Evaluation Network" and filed March 31, 1998; U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/083,483 entitled "Method and Apparatus for Selling an Aging Food Product" and filed May 22, 1998; U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/282,747 entitled "Method and Apparatus for Providing Cross-Benefits Based on a Customer Activity" and filed March 31, 1999; U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 08/943,483 entitled "System and Method for Facilitating Acceptance of Conditional Purchase Offers (CPOs)" and filed on October 3, 1997, which is a continuation-in-part of U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 08/923,683 entitled "Conditional Purchase Offer (CPO) Management System For Packages" and filed September 4, 1997, which is a continuation-in-part of U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 08/889,319 entitled "Conditional Purchase Offer Management System" and filed July 8, 1997, which is a continuation-in-part of U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 08/707,660 entitled "Method and Apparatus for a Cryptographically Assisted Commercial Network System Designed to Facilitate Buyer-Driven Conditional Purchase Offers," filed on September 4, 1996 and issued as U.S. Patent No. 5,794,207 on August 11, 1998; U.S. Patent Application No. 08/920,116 entitled "Method and System for Processing Supplementary Product Sales at a Point-Of-Sale Terminal" and filed August 26, 1997, which is a continuation-in-part of U.S. Patent Application No. 08/822,709 entitled "System and Method for Performing Lottery Ticket Transactions Utilizing Point-Of-Sale Terminals" and filed March 21, 1997; U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/135,179 entitled "Method and Apparatus for Determining Whether a Verbal Message Was Spoken During a Transaction at a Point-Of-Sale Terminal" and filed August 17, 1998; U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/538,751 entitled "Dynamic Propagation of Promotional Information in a Network of Point-of-Sale Terminals" and filed March 30, 2000; U.S. Patent Application Serial No.

09/442,754 entitled "Method and System for Processing Supplementary Product Sales at a Point-of-Sale Terminal" and filed November 12, 1999; U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/045,386 entitled "Method and Apparatus For Controlling the Performance of a Supplementary Process at a Point-of-Sale Terminal" and filed March 20, 1998; U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/045,347 entitled "Method and Apparatus for Providing a Supplementary Product Sale at a Point-of-Sale Terminal" and filed March 20, 1998; U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/083,689 entitled "Method and System for Selling Supplementary Products at a Point-of Sale and filed May 21, 1998; U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/045,518 entitled "Method and Apparatus for Processing a Supplementary Product Sale at a Point-of-Sale Terminal" and filed March 20, 1998; U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/076,409 entitled "Method and Apparatus for Generating a Coupon" and filed May 12, 1998; U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/045,084 entitled "Method and Apparatus for Controlling Offers that are Provided at a Point-of-Sale Terminal" and filed March 20, 1998; U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/098,240 entitled "System and Method for Applying and Tracking a Conditional Value Coupon for a Retail Establishment" and filed June 16, 1998; U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/157,837 entitled "Method and Apparatus for Selling an Aging Food Product as a Substitute for an Ordered Product" and filed September 21, 1998, which is a continuation of U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/083,483 entitled "Method and Apparatus for Selling an Aging Food Product" and filed May 22, 1998; U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/603,677 entitled "Method and Apparatus for selecting a Supplemental Product to offer for Sale During a Transaction" and filed June 26, 2000; U.S. Patent No. 6,119,100 entitled "Method and Apparatus for Managing the Sale of Aging Products and filed October 6, 1997 and U.S. Provisional Patent Application Serial No. 60/239,610 entitled "Methods and Apparatus for Performing Upsells" and filed October 11, 2000. The entire contents of these applications and/or patents are incorporated herein by reference as part of the present disclosure.

REFERENCE TO COMPUTER PROGRAM LISTING APPENDIX

A computer program listing appendix has been submitted on two compact discs. All material on the compact discs is incorporated herein by reference as part of the present disclosure. There are two (2) compact discs, one (1) original and one (1) duplicate, and each compact disc includes the following ninety files:

| FILE NAME | SIZE IN BYTES | DATE CREATED |
|-----------|---------------|--------------|
|-----------|---------------|--------------|

| | | | |
|--|--------|----------|--|
| ActionSet.java | 26,409 | 10/31/01 | |
| ArmTimerOrderProcessor.java | 7,095 | 10/26/01 | |
| BayesRule.java | 6,274 | 10/26/01 | |
| BioNET.java | 22,152 | 10/24/01 | |
| BioNetDatabase.java | 40,708 | 11/1/01 | |
| BioNetNonTerminalException.java | 5,108 | 10/30/01 | |
| BioNetTerminalException.java | 3,140 | 8/27/01 | |
| BioNetUtilities.java | 11,850 | 10/18/01 | |
| Classifier.java | 47,169 | 10/29/01 | |
| ClassifierFieldManager.java | 8,385 | 10/30/01 | |
| ClassifierPopulation.java | 25,894 | 10/30/01 | |
| ClassifierSet.java | 12,784 | 10/30/01 | |
| ClassifierStatistics.java | 13,778 | 10/29/01 | |
| ClassifierSystem.java | 4,248 | 11/7/01 | |
| ConditionalProbability.java | 3,433 | 10/26/01 | |
| ConditionalProbabilityMap.java | 5,566 | 10/17/01 | |
| ConditionalProbabilityMap_Double.java | 2,090 | 10/17/01 | |
| ConditionalProbabilityMap_Integer.java | 1,760 | 10/17/01 | |
| ConditionalProbability_Integer.java | 4,059 | 10/26/01 | |
| ConfigurationEvent.java | 3,373 | 10/29/01 | |
| ConfigurationEventListener.java | 899 | 9/4/01 | |
| DatabaseField.java | 1,773 | 8/27/01 | |
| DBbioNETConfig.java | 15,479 | 10/30/01 | |
| DBCashiers.java | 3,909 | 10/31/01 | |
| DBconfig.java | 4,747 | 10/31/01 | |
| DBdataSubsystem.java | 1,548 | 11/2/01 | |
| DBdataSubsystemFactory.java | 9,749 | 10/28/01 | |
| DBdataSubsystemFactoryPhase1.java | 3,914 | 10/28/01 | |
| DBdataSubsystemFactoryPhase2.java | 3,909 | 10/28/01 | |
| DBdestinations.java | 4,264 | 10/31/01 | |
| DBintDescription.java | 7,553 | 10/31/01 | |
| DBmappedNodes.java | 13,742 | 10/31/01 | |
| DBmenuItem.java | 41,161 | 11/6/01 | |

| | | |
|------------------------------|--------|----------|
| DBmenuItemPeriod.java | 19,505 | 11/6/01 |
| DBmenuItemPhase1.java | 7,273 | 11/1/01 |
| DBmenuItemProbability.java | 7,266 | 11/1/01 |
| DBmenuItems.java | 51,588 | 11/6/01 |
| DBmenuItemsPhase1.java | 4,819 | 11/1/01 |
| DBperiod.java | 14,043 | 11/4/01 |
| DBperiodCounts.java | 5,320 | 11/4/01 |
| DBperiods.java | 27,560 | 11/6/01 |
| DBregisters.java | 4,228 | 10/31/01 |
| DebugPrintNothing.java | 1,861 | 11/2/01 |
| DebugPrintOut.java | 8,181 | 11/2/01 |
| DigitalDealDatabase.java | 4,175 | 10/31/01 |
| Evolvable.java | 1,301 | 11/2/01 |
| EvolverAgent.java | 3,676 | 11/2/01 |
| GeneratesOffers.java | 1,575 | 11/2/01 |
| HasNamedFields.java | 1,319 | 11/2/01 |
| IdenticalOfferAgent.java | 3,467 | 11/2/01 |
| IdenticalOfferInterface.java | 1,376 | 11/2/01 |
| InitializeFromResultSet.java | 1,336 | 8/27/01 |
| Lcs.java | 17,294 | 10/30/01 |
| LcsItem.java | 2,038 | 11/2/01 |
| LearnerAgent.java | 6,017 | 11/6/01 |
| Learns.java | 1,637 | 11/2/01 |
| MappedNodeInterface.java | 1,254 | 10/18/01 |
| MappedNodeManager.java | 1,883 | 10/18/01 |
| MapsPeriodIds.java | 1,202 | 10/9/01 |
| MenuItemEvent.java | 6,027 | 11/1/01 |
| MenuItemListener.java | 1,238 | 11/1/01 |
| ObservedOutcomes.java | 1,812 | 10/17/01 |
| Offerable.java | 2,042 | 11/5/01 |
| Offerables.java | 3,005 | 10/25/01 |
| OfferGeneratingInstance.java | 4,952 | 11/6/01 |
| OfferGenerator.java | 5,139 | 10/19/01 |

| | | |
|---------------------------------|--------|----------|
| OfferItem.java | 20,105 | 11/6/01 |
| OfferPoolCreator.java | 8,324 | 10/26/01 |
| Order.java | 15,403 | 10/29/01 |
| Orderable.java | 1,346 | 11/5/01 |
| Orderables.java | 1,998 | 10/16/01 |
| OrderItem.java | 8,136 | 11/5/01 |
| OrderProcessor.java | 8,737 | 9/27/01 |
| OverDollarOfferPoolCreator.java | 2,173 | 10/26/01 |
| PeriodCounts.java | 789 | 11/4/01 |
| PeriodIdMapper.java | 2,162 | 10/26/01 |
| PredictionArray.java | 13,648 | 10/29/01 |
| RefreshAgent.java | 1,769 | 10/24/01 |
| RefreshListener.java | 1,384 | 11/2/01 |
| SqlStatement.java | 16,751 | 10/24/01 |
| StateEvent.java | 2,986 | 10/2/01 |
| StateEventListener.java | 875 | 9/20/01 |
| SystemParameters.java | 18,660 | 10/29/01 |
| TimerArmedOrderProcessor.java | 4,747 | 9/26/01 |
| TimerThread.java | 1,304 | 10/24/01 |
| Updatable.java | 1,398 | 10/29/01 |
| UpgradeAgent.java | 2,644 | 10/25/01 |
| WakeUpAction.java | 880 | 8/28/01 |
| XcsInstance.java | 25,626 | 11/6/01 |
| XcsOfferItem.java | 7,860 | 10/29/01 |

BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION

Everyday, several companies spend significant sums of time and money in an effort to improve their operations. These efforts are manifested in various programs including training, communications, computer systems, product development and more. Historically, computerized systems have been instrumental in controlling costs and tracking performance within all of these disciplines. These systems have grown in flexibility and capability and, in general, have been perfected. Newer systems, like RetailDNA's Digital Deal™ system, are emerging and are now focused on driving increases in revenues and profits. Some of these

systems, like the Digital Deal, are rules based and often permit user modifications that can drive incremental performance improvements.

Unfortunately, these systems have not had a mechanism to help change behavior or improve themselves over time. Therefore, the results these systems are able to produce are dependent upon the discipline and performance of store and senior management or systems support personnel. For example, if the database within a labor scheduling package is not kept up to date or routinely "fine tuned" it may become ineffective.

It would be advantageous to provide a method and apparatus that overcame the drawbacks of the prior art.

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE INVENTION

The present invention can change the way business practices and processes are improved over time. The invention may be used to improve system parameters of systems such as the Digital DealTM. For example, a system that provides customers with dynamically-priced upsell offers (defined below) may be improved to make offers that are more likely to be accepted. A description of systems that can provide dynamically priced upsell offers may be found in the following U.S. Patent Applications:

U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/083,483 entitled "Method and Apparatus for Selling an Aging Food Product" and filed May 22, 1998; U.S. Patent Application No. 08/920,116 entitled "Method and System for Processing Supplementary Product Sales at a Point-Of-Sale Terminal" and filed August 26, 1997; U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/538,751 entitled "Dynamic Propagation of Promotional Information in a Network of Point-of-Sale Terminals" and filed March 30, 2000; U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/442,754 entitled "Method and System for Processing Supplementary Product Sales at a Point-of-Sale Terminal" and filed November 12, 1999; U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/045,386 entitled "Method and Apparatus For Controlling the Performance of a Supplementary Process at a Point-of-Sale Terminal" and filed March 20, 1998; U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/045,347 entitled "Method and Apparatus for Providing a Supplementary Product Sale at a Point-of-Sale Terminal" and filed March 20, 1998; U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/083,689 entitled "Method and System for Selling Supplementary Products at a Point-of Sale and filed May 21, 1998; U.S. Patent Application

Serial No. 09/045,518 entitled "Method and Apparatus for Processing a Supplementary Product Sale at a Point-of-Sale Terminal" and filed March 20, 1998; U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/076,409 entitled "Method and Apparatus for Generating a Coupon" and filed May 12, 1998; U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/045,084 entitled "Method and Apparatus for Controlling Offers that are Provided at a Point-of-Sale Terminal" and filed March 20, 1998; U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/098,240 entitled "System and Method for Applying and Tracking a Conditional Value Coupon for a Retail Establishment" and filed June 16, 1998; U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/157,837 entitled "Method and Apparatus for Selling an Aging Food Product as a Substitute for an Ordered Product" and filed September 21, 1998; U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/603,677 entitled "Method and Apparatus for selecting a Supplemental Product to offer for Sale During a Transaction" and filed June 26, 2000; U.S. Patent No. 6,119,100 entitled "Method and Apparatus for Managing the Sale of Aging Products and filed October 6, 1997.

Further, the present invention can permit and enable other rules-based applications to become "self improving."

Various embodiments of the present invention can take advantage of a multitude of data sources and transform these data into genetic codes or 'synthetic' DNA. The DNA is then used within an artificial biological environment, which the embodiments of the present invention can replicate. For example, each transaction may be analogized to an individual (species) in a population. When transactions are proven successful under certain environmental conditions (e.g., particular cashier or customer, time of day, day of week, certain store configuration, whether the destination is drive through or dine in, customer demographics), embodiments of the present invention can "propagate" that success. By culling unsuccessful transactions from the synthetic ecosystem, embodiments of the present invention can help eliminate undesirable transactions. Conversely, embodiments of the present invention can encourage the propagation of successful transactions, which drives incremental performance improvements.

The following is an example of one embodiment of the present invention, offered for illustration only.

RetailDNA offers a product referred to as the Digital DealTM, which dynamically generates suggestive sell offers that usually include some form of value proposition (or discount). Customers either accept the offer or they don't. By providing results data from

the Digital Deal to the system described herein, overall customer accept rates and customer satisfaction may be improved. Each customer transaction (successful or not) can be translated into genetic strings or DNA. The transactions are measured as to their overall success ratings (success may be defined by subjectively according to any criteria) and includes (in this case), the percentage of customers accepting the deal and the value of the deal to the restaurant operator, and are propagated based upon these ratings. In this way, the system can exploit practices that are known to yield positive results according to various priorities.

In an effort to explore new possibilities, in various embodiments the system may periodically create new combinations of the DNA. In the preceding example, these new DNA combinations are new offers that have not yet been tried or written into rules. Embodiments of the present invention leverage success by distributing these new ideas. The more information that is made available to the system, the faster the system can improve results. Embodiments of the present invention can spread out new ideas over many sites. In such embodiments, the risk and costs associated with introducing a new strand are thereby reduced while simultaneously gathering significant results in a short period.

Embodiments of the present invention may also measure the actual results of both existing and new DNA and may continuously evolve to improve the overall effectiveness of the improved system. Since the whole process is automated, no human intervention is required to continuously improve. Thus, embodiments of the present invention can automatically adjust software settings to continuously generate incremental improvements in operational and financial performance., dramatically changing the way information systems affect the day-to-day operations of businesses. This may be accomplished by, e.g., creating a new model and method for involving and leveraging customers, systems and / or employees within an organization.

The computer program listing appendix included herein describes a program which may be used to practice an embodiment of the present invention.

DEFINITIONS

The terms listed below shall be interpreted according to the following definitions in connection with this specification and the appended claims.

POS terminal - a device that is used in association with a purchase transaction and having some computing capabilities and/or being in communication with a device having computing capabilities. Examples of POS terminals include but are not limited to a cash

register, a personal computer, a portable computer, a portable computing device such as a Personal Digital Assistant (PDA), a wired or wireless telephone, vending machines, automatic teller machine, a communication device, card authorization terminals, and / or credit card validation terminals.

Offer - an offer, promotion, proposal or advertising message communicated to a customer at a POS terminal, including upsell offers (such as dynamically-priced upsell offers), suggestive sell offers, switch-and-save offers, conditional subsidy offers, coupon offers, rebates, and discounts.

Upsell Offer - a proposal to a customer that he or she may purchase an additional product or service. For example, the customer may have an additional product or service added to a transaction.

Dynamically-priced upsell offer - an upsell offer in which the price to be charged for the additional product depends on a round-up amount associated with the transaction. For example, the round-up amount may be the difference between the transaction total (the amount the customer is required to pay without an upsell) and the next highest dollar amount greater than the transaction total. According to this specific example, if the transaction total without the upsell is \$4.25, then the round-up amount is \$0.75 ($\$5.00 - \$4.25 = \0.75). In general, the round-up amount may also be based on the difference between any of a number of values associated with the transaction total and any other transaction total. For example, if the transaction total without the upsell is \$87.50, the round-up amount may be \$11.50, resulting in a new transaction total of \$99.00. Other information, such as an amount of sales tax associated with the transaction, may also be used to determine the round-up amount.

Suggestive sell offer - an upsell offer in which the price to be paid for the additional item is a list, retail or standard price.

Switch-and-save offer - a proposal to a customer that another product be substituted for (or sold in lieu of) a product already included in a transaction. In various embodiments, the substitute product is offered and / or sold for less than its standard price.

Cross-subsidy offer (also referred to as a “conditional subsidy offer”) - an offer to provide a benefit (e.g., to subsidize a purchase price, to purchase a product for a lower price) from a third-party merchant in exchange for the customer performing and / or agreeing to perform one or more tasks. For example, a customer may be offered a benefit in exchange for the customer (i) applying for a service offered by a third-party, (ii) subscribing to a

service offered by a third-party, (iii) receiving information such as an advertisement, and / or (iv) providing information such as answers to survey questions.

Several embodiments of the invention will now be described with reference to the drawings.

System Overview

Fig. 1 illustrates, in the form of a block diagram, a simplified view of a POS network in which the present invention may be applied.

In Fig. 1, reference numeral 20 generally refers to the POS network. The network 20 is seen to include a plurality of POS terminals 22, of which only three are explicitly shown in Fig. 1. It should be understood that in various embodiments of the invention the number of POS terminals in the network may, for example, be as few as one, or, may number in the hundreds, thousands or millions. In certain embodiments, the POS terminals 22 in the POS network 20 may, but need not, all be constituted by identical hardware devices. In other embodiments dramatically different hardware devices may be employed as the POS terminals 22. Any standard type of POS terminal hardware may be employed, provided that it is suitable for programming or operation in accordance with the teachings of this invention. The POS terminals 22 may, for example, be “intelligent” devices of the types which incorporate a general purpose microprocessor or microcontroller. Alternatively, some or all of the POS terminals 22 may be “dumb” terminals, which are controlled, partially or substantially, by a separate device (e.g., a computing device) which is either in the same location with the terminal or located remotely therefrom.

Although not indicated in Fig. 1, the POS terminals 22 may be co-located (e.g., located within the same store, restaurant or other business location), or one or more of the POS terminals 22 may be located in a different location (e.g., located within different stores, restaurants or other business locations, in homes, in malls, changing mobile locations). Indeed, the invention may be applied in numerous store locations, each of which may have any number of POS terminals 22 installed therein. In one embodiment of the invention, the POS terminals 22 may be of the type utilized at restaurants, such as quick-service restaurants. According to one embodiment of the invention, POS terminals 22 in one location may communicate with a controller device (not shown in Fig. 1), which may in turn communicate with the server 24. Note that in certain embodiments of the present invention, all the elements shown in FIG. 1 may also be located in a single location.

Server 24 is connected for data communication with the POS terminals 22 via a communication network 26. The server 24 may comprise conventional computer hardware that is programmed in accordance with the invention. In various embodiments, the server 24 may comprise an application server and / or a database server.

The data communication network 26 may also interconnect the POS terminals 22 for communication with each other. The network 26 may be constituted by any appropriate combination of conventional data communication media, including terrestrial lines, radio waves, infrared, satellite data links, microwave links and the Internet. The network 26 may allow access to other sources of information, e.g., such as may be found on the Internet. In various embodiments the server 24 may be directly connected (e.g., connected without employing the network 26) with one or more of the POS terminals 22. Similarly, two or more of the POS terminals 22 may be directly connected (e.g., connected without employing the network 26).

Fig. 2 is a simplified block diagram showing an exemplary embodiment for the server 24. The server 24 may be embodied, for example, as an RS 6000 server, manufactured by IBM Corporation, and programmed to execute functions and operations of the present invention. Any other known server may be similarly employed, as may any known device that can be programmed to operate appropriately in accordance with the description herein. The server 24 may include known hardware components such as a processor 28 which is connected for data communication with each of one or more data storage devices 30, one or more input devices 32 and one or more communication ports 34. The communication port 34 may connect the server 24 to each of the POS terminals 22, thereby permitting the server 24 to communicate with the POS terminals. The communication port 34 may include multiple communication channels for simultaneous connections.

As seen from Fig. 2, the data storage device 30, which may comprise a hard disk drive, CD-ROM, DVD and / or semiconductor memory, stores a program 36. The program 36 is, at least in part, provided in accordance with the invention and controls the processor 28 to carry out functions which are described herein. The program 36 may also include other program elements, such as an operating system, database management system and "device drivers", for allowing the processor 28 to perform known functions such as interface with peripheral devices (e.g., input devices 32, the communication port 34) in a manner known to those of skill in the art. Appropriate device drivers and other necessary program elements are known to those skilled in the art, and need not be described in detail herein. The storage

device 30 may also store application programs and data that are not related to the functions described herein. One or more databases also may be stored in the data storage device 30, referred to generally as database 38. Exemplary databases that may be present within the data storage device 30 include a classifier database adapted to store classifiers as described below with reference to FIGS. 4 and 5, a genetic programs database adapted to store genetic programs as described below with reference to FIG. 6, an inventory database, a customer database and/or any other relevant database. Not all embodiments of the present invention require a server 24. That is, methods of the present invention may be performed by the POS terminals 22 themselves in a distributed and / or de-centralized manner.

Fig. 3 illustrates in the form of a simplified block diagram a typical one of the POS terminals 22. The POS terminal 22 includes a processor 50 which may be a conventional microprocessor. The processor 50 is in communication with a data storage device 52 which may be constituted by one or more of semiconductor memory, a hard disk drive, or other conventional types of computer memory. The processor 50 and the storage device 52 may each be (i) located entirely within a single electronic device such as a cash register/terminal or other computing device; (ii) connected to each other by a remote communication medium such as a serial port, cable, telephone line or radio frequency transceiver or (iii) a combination thereof. For example, the POS terminal 22 may include one or more computers or processors that are connected to a remote server computer for maintaining databases.

Also operatively connected to the processor 50 are one or more input devices 54 which may include, for example, a key pad for transmitting input signals such as signals indicative of a purchase, to the processor 50. The input devices 54 may also include an optical bar code scanner for reading bar codes and transmitting signals indicative of the bar codes to the processor 50. Another type of input device 54 that may be included in the POS terminal 22 is a touch screen.

The POS terminal 22 further includes one or more output devices 56. The output devices 56 may include, for example, a printer for generating sales receipts, coupons and the like under the control of processor 50. The output devices 56 may also include a character or full screen display for providing text and/or other messages to customers and to the operator of the POS terminal (e.g., a cashier). The output devices 56 are in communication with, and are controlled by, the processor 50.

Also in communication with the processor 50 is a communication port 58 through which the POS terminal 22 may communicate with other components of the POS network 20, including the server 24 and/or other POS terminals 22.

As seen from Fig. 3, the storage device 52 stores a program 60. The program 60 is provided at least in part in accordance with the invention and controls the processor 50 to carry out functions in accordance with the teachings of the invention. The program 60 may also include other program elements, such as an operating system and "device drivers" for allowing the processor 50 to interface with peripheral devices such as the input devices 54, the output devices 56 and the communication port 58. Appropriate device drivers and other necessary program elements are known to those skilled in the art, and need not be described in detail herein. The storage device 52 may also store one or more application programs for carrying out conventional functions of POS terminal 22. Other programs and data not related to the functions described herein may also be stored in storage device 52. In a de-centralized embodiment of the invention, the storage device 52 may contain one or more of the previously described databases as represented generally by database 62 (e.g., a classifier database adapted to store classifiers as described below with reference to FIGS. 4 and 5, a genetic programs database adapted to store genetic programs as described below with reference to FIG. 6, an inventory database, a customer database and/or any other relevant database).

FIG. 4 is a flowchart of a first exemplary process 400 for generating rules and/or offers in accordance with the present invention. As described further below, the process 400 employs an extended classifier system ("XCS") for rule/offer generation. Extended classifier systems are described in Wilson, "Classifier Fitness Based on Accuracy", Evolutionary Computation, Vol. 3, No. 2, pp. 149-175 (1995).

Note that while the process 400 is described primarily with reference to the generation of rules/offers within a quick-service restaurant ("QSR") such as McDonald's, Kentucky Fried Chicken, etc., it will be understood that the process 400 and the other processes described herein may be employed to generate rules/offers within any business setting (e.g., offers within a retail setting such as offers for clothing, groceries or other goods, offers for services, etc.). The process 400 and the other processes described herein may be embodied within software, hardware or a combination thereof, and each may comprise a computer program product. The process 400, for example, may be implemented via computer program code (e.g., written in C, C++, Java or any other computer language) that resides within the

server 24 (e.g., within the data storage device 30) and/or within one or more of the POS terminals 22. In the embodiment described below, the process 400 comprises computer program code that resides within the server 24 (e.g., a server within a QSR that controls the offers made by the POS terminals 22 that reside within the QSR). This embodiment is merely exemplary of one of many embodiments of the invention.

With reference to FIG. 4, in step 401, the process 400 starts. In step 402, the server 24 receives order information. For example, a customer may visit a QSR that employs the server 24, and place an order at one of the POS terminals 22 (e.g., an order for a hamburger and fries); and the POS terminal 22 may communicate the order information to the server 24. The order information may include, for example, the items ordered by the customer (e.g., a hamburger, fries, etc.) or any other information (e.g., the identity of the customer, the time of day, the day of the week, the month of the year, the outside temperature, the identity of the cashier, destination information (e.g., eat in or take out) or any other information relevant to offer generation). Note that order information may be received from one or more POS terminals and/or from any other source (e.g., via a PDA of a customer, via an e-mail from a customer, via a telephone call, etc.) and may be based on data stored within the server 24 such as time of day, temperature, inventory or the like.

In step 403, the server 24 translates the order information into a bit stream (e.g., a binary bit stream or sequence of bits that represent the order information). For example, each ordered item identifier may be translated into a predetermined number and sequence of bits, and the bit sequence for all ordered item identifiers then may be appended together to form the bit stream. Other order information such as time of day, day of week, month of year, cashier identity, customer identity, destination (e.g., eat in or take out), temperature, etc., similarly may be converted into bit sequences and appended to the bit stream. Bit streams may be of any length (e.g., depending on the amount of order information, the bit sequence lengths employed, etc.). In one embodiment, a bit stream length of 960 bits is employed.

In one exemplary translation process, each item that may be ordered by a customer (e.g., each menu item), is broken down into its component parts (e.g., a hamburger equals beef, bread, sauce, etc.), each component part is assigned a bit sequence, and the bit sequence for the item is formed from a combination of the bit sequences of each component part of the item (e.g., beef = 1, bread = 4, sauce = 32 so that the hamburger bit sequence equals $1+4+32=37$ or 100101). Any other translation scheme may be similarly employed. To keep each bit stream uniform in length (e.g., to allow matching between bit streams and classifiers

as described below), each order is assumed to comprise a pre-determined number of items (e.g., six or some other number), and one or more null bit sequences may be employed within the bit stream if less than the number of pre-determined items are ordered.

Once a bit stream has been generated based on the order information (step 403), in step 404, the bit stream is matched to “classifiers” stored by the server 24 (e.g., classifiers stored within the database 38 of the data storage device 30). In at least one embodiment of the invention, each “classifier” comprises a “condition” and an “action” that is similar to an “if – then” rule. That is, if the condition is met (e.g., certain items are ordered on a certain day, at a certain time, by a certain customer, etc.), then the action is performed (e.g., a customer is offered an upsell offer, a dynamically-priced upsell offer, a suggestive sell offer, a switch-and-save offer, a cross-subsidy offer or any other offer). In the process 400 of FIG. 4, a bit stream is matched to a classifier by matching the bits of the bit stream with the bits of the classifier that represent the condition of the classifier. Methods for defining classifiers and for matching order information bit streams with classifiers are described in Appendix A herein. Note that matching may occur at the bit level, at the bit sequence level or at any other level.

In step 405, the server 24 determines if a sufficient number of classifiers have been matched to the bit stream (determined in step 403). For example, the server 24 may require that at least a minimum number of classifiers (e.g., ten) match the bit stream in order to search as much of the available offer space as possible). Note that each matching classifier need not have a unique action.

If a minimum number classifiers has not been matched to the bit stream, the process 400 proceeds to step 406 wherein additional matching classifiers are created (e.g., enough additional matching classifiers so that the minimum number of matching classifiers set by the server 24 is met); otherwise the process 400 proceeds to step 407. Additional matching classifiers may be created by any technique (see, for example, process 500 in FIG. 5), and may be added to the “population” of classifiers stored within the server 24 (e.g., by creating a new database record for each additional matching classifier, or by replacing non-matching classifiers with the additional matching classifiers). A “reward” associated with each additional classifier (described below with reference to step 407) may be determined based on, for example, a weighted average of the reward of each classifier already present within the server 24. Any other method may be employed to determine a reward for additional matching classifiers. Following step 406, the process 400 proceeds to step 407.

In step 407, the server 24 determines (e.g., calculates or otherwise identifies) an expected reward for each matching classifier (e.g., a predicted “payoff” of the action associated with the classifier). Rewards, predicted payoffs and other relevant factors in classifier selection are described further in Appendix A.

In step 408, the server 24 determines whether it should “explore” or “exploit” the matching classifiers. For example, if the server 24 wishes to explore customer response (e.g., take rate) to the actions associated with the matching classifiers (e.g., upsell, dynamically-priced upsell, suggestive sell, switch-and-save, cross-subsidy or other offers), the server 24 may select one of the actions of the matching classifiers at random (step 409). The server 24 may choose to “explore” for other reasons (e.g., to ensure that random actions/offers are communicated to cashiers that may be gaming or otherwise attempting to cheat the system 20). However, if the server 24 wishes to maximize profits, the server 24 may select the action of the matching classifier having the highest expected reward (step 410) given the current input conditions (e.g., order content, time of day, day of week, month of year, temperature, customer identity, cashier identity, weather, destination, etc.).

In step 411, the server 24 communicates the selected action to the relevant POS terminal 22 (e.g., the terminal from which the server 24 received the order information), and the POS terminal performs the action (e.g., makes an offer to the customer via the cashier, via a customer display device, etc.). In step 412, the server 24 determines the results of the selected action (e.g., whether the cashier made the offer to the customer, whether the customer accepted or rejected the offer, etc.) and generates a “reward” based on the result of the action. Rewards are described in further detail in Appendix A. Thereafter, in step 413, the server 24 updates the statistics of all classifiers identified in step 404 and/or in step 406 (see, for example, Appendix A). A classifier’s statistics may be updated, for example, by updating the expected reward associated with the classifier. In step 414 the process ends.

Under certain circumstances, the server 24 may wish to introduce “new” classifiers to the population of classifiers stored within the server 24. For example, the server 24 may wish to introduce new classifiers to ensure that the classifiers being employed by the server 24 are the “best” classifiers for the server 24 (e.g., generate the most profits, increase customer traffic, have the best take rates, align offers with current promotions or advertising campaigns, promote new products, assist/facilitate inventory management and control, reduce cashier and/or customer gaming, drive sales growth, increase share holder/stock value and/or achieve any other goals or objective).

FIG. 5 is a flow chart of an exemplary process 500 for generating additional classifiers in accordance with the present invention. The process 500 may be performed at any time, on a random or a periodic basis. As with the process 400 of FIG. 4, the process 500 of FIG. 5 may be embodied as computer program code stored by the server 24 (e.g., in the data storage device 30) and may comprise, for example, a computer program product.

With reference to FIG. 5, the process 500 begins in step 501. In step 502, the server 24 selects two classifiers. The classifiers may be selected at random, may be selected because each has a high expected reward value, may be selected because the classifiers are part of a group of classifiers that match order information received by the server 24, and/or may be selected for any other reason. Thereafter, in step 503, a crossover operation is performed on the two classifiers so as to generate two "offspring" classifiers, and in step 504, each offspring classifier is mutated. Exemplary crossovers and mutations of classifiers are described further in Appendix A. An expected reward also may be generated for each offspring classifier (e.g., by taking a weighted average of other classifiers). In step 505, the offspring classifiers produced in step 504 are introduced into the classifier population of the server 24. For example, new database records may be generated for each offspring classifier, or one or more offspring classifiers may replace existing classifiers. In at least one embodiment, an offspring classifier is introduced in the classifier population only if the offspring classifier has a perceived value (e.g., an expected reward) that is higher than the classifier it replaces. In step 506, the process 500 ends.

Patent applications and patents incorporated by reference herein disclose, among other things, a dynamically-priced upsell module (DPUM) server for providing dynamically-priced upsell offers (e.g., "Digital Deal" offers) to POS terminals clients. Appendix A illustrates one embodiment of the present invention wherein the process 400 (FIG. 4), process 500 (FIG. 5) and/or XCS classifiers in general are implemented within a DPUM server. It will be understood that the present invention may be implemented in a separate server, with or without the DPUM server, and that Appendix A represents only one implementation of the present invention.

In addition to employing XCS techniques, the present invention also employs other evolutionary programming techniques for generating rules and/or offers. Appendix B illustrates one exemplary embodiment of employing Markov and Bayesian techniques with genetic programs for the generation of offers within a QSR (e.g., in association with a DPUM server). It will be understood that the evolutionary programming techniques and other

methods described herein and in Appendix B may be employed to generate offers within any business setting (e.g., offers within a retail setting such as offers for clothing, groceries or other goods, offers for services, etc.).

FIG. 6 is a flowchart of a second exemplary process 600 for generating rules and/or offers in accordance with the present invention. The process 600 and the other processes described herein may be embodied within software, hardware or a combination thereof, and each may comprise a computer program product. The process 600, for example, may be implemented via computer program code (e.g., written in C, C++, Java or any other computer language) that resides within the server 24 (e.g., within the data storage device 30) and/or within one or more of the POS terminals 22. In the embodiment described below, the process 600 comprises computer program code that resides within the server 24 (e.g., a server within a QSR that controls the offers made by the POS terminals 22 that reside within the QSR). This embodiment is merely exemplary of many embodiments of the invention.

With reference to FIG. 6, in step 601, the process 600 starts. In step 602, the server 24 receives order information. For example, a customer may visit a QSR that employs the server 24, and place an order at one of the POS terminals 22 (e.g., an order for a hamburger and fries); and the POS terminal 22 may communicate the order information to the server 24. The order information may include, for example, the items ordered by the customer (e.g., a hamburger, fries, etc.) or any other information (e.g., the identity of the customer, the time of day, the day of the week, the month of the year, the outside temperature or any information relevant to offer generation). Note that order information may be received from one or more POS terminals and/or from any other source (e.g., via a PDA of a customer, via an e-mail from a customer, via a telephone call, etc.) and may be based on data stored within server 24 such as time of day, temperature, inventory or the like.

In step 603, the server 24 converts the order information into numerical values. For example, environmental information (e.g., time of day, day of week, month of year, customer identity, cashier identity, etc.) and order item identifiers are each assigned a numeric value (see Appendix B). Thereafter, in step 604, based on the order information (e.g., using the numerical values associated with the order information as an input), the server 24 employs Markov and Bayesian principles to identify associations between ordered items and other items that may be sold to the customer. That is, the server 24 determines all items that may be offered to the customer based on the customer's order (and/or all actions that may be

undertaken to offer items to the customer), and a “relevancy” of each item to the customer’s order (e.g., a measure of whether the customer will accept an offer for the item).

In step 605, the server 24 scores the potential actions (e.g., offers) that the server may communicate to the POS terminal that transmitted the order information to the server 24 (e.g., all offers that may be made to the customer). In at least one embodiment, the server 24 scores the potential actions by assigning a numeric value to the relevancy of each item/action.

In step 606, the server 24 determines which actions/offers may/should be undertaken (e.g., which offers may/should be made to the customer). For example, the server 24 may choose to eliminate any actions that are not profitable (e.g., upselling an apple pie for one penny), that are impractical or unlikely to be accepted (e.g., offering a hamburger as part of a breakfast meal) or that are otherwise undesirable.

In step 607, the server 24 employs a genetic program to generate offers that are maximized (e.g., to pick the “best” action for the system 20). For example, the server 24 may generate offers/actions based on such considerations as relevancy, profit, discount percentage, preparation time, ongoing promotions, inventory, customer satisfaction or any other factors. Exemplary genetic programs and their use are described in more detail in Appendix B. In general, the server 24 may employ one or more genetic programs to generate offers/actions. In at least one embodiment, the server 24 employs numerous genetic programs (e.g., a hundred or more), and each genetic program is given an equal opportunity to generate offers/actions (e.g., based on a random selection, a “round robin” selection, etc.). In other embodiments, a weighted average scheme may be employed for offer/action generation (e.g., offers/actions may be generated based on a weighted average of one or more business objectives such as generating the most profits, increasing customer traffic, having the best take rates, aligning offers with current promotions or advertising campaigns, promoting new products, assisting/facilitating inventory management and control, reducing cashier and/or customer gaming, driving sales growth, increasing share holder/stock value, promoting offer deal values that are less than a dollar or more than a dollar, etc., based on various factors such as acceptance/take rate, average check information (e.g., to mitigate customer and/or cashier gaming), cashier information (e.g., how well a cashier makes certain offers) and/or based on any other goals, objectives or information). Filters and/or other sort criteria similarly may be employed. Note that weighting, filtering and/or sorting schemes also may be employed during the explore/exploit selection processes described previously with reference to FIG. 4 and process 400.

In step 608, the server 24 communicates the offer (or offers) to the relevant POS terminal 22, which in turn communicates the offer (or offers) to the customer (e.g., via a cashier, via a customer display device, etc.). Thereafter, in step 609, the server 24 determines the customer's response to the offer (e.g., assuming the cashier communicated the offer to the customer, whether the offer was accepted or rejected). Note that whether or not a cashier communicates an offer to a customer may be determined employing voice recognition technology as described in previously incorporated U.S. Patent Application No. 09/135,179, filed August 17, 1998, or by any other method. For example, it has been discovered that the time delay between when an offer is presented to a customer and when the offer is accepted by the customer may indicate that a cashier is gaming (e.g., if the time delay is too small, the cashier may not have presented the offer to the customer, and the cashier may have charged the customer full price for an upsell and kept any discount amount achievable from the offer).

In step 610, the server 24 trains the genetic programs stored by the server 24 based on the results of whether the offer was made by the cashier, accepted by the customer or rejected by the customer (e.g., the server 24 "distributes the reward"). Exemplary reward distributions are described in more detail in Appendix B. In step 611, the process 600 ends.

As with the XCS techniques described with reference to FIG. 4 and Appendix A, new genetic programs may be created using crossover, replication and mutation processes. For example, a new population of genetic programs (e.g., offspring genetic programs) may be generated by "mating" (e.g., via crossover) two genetic programs, by replicating an existing genetic program and/or by mutating an existing genetic program or offspring genetic program. Selection of "parent" genetic programs may be based on, for example, the success (e.g., "fitness" described in Appendix B) of the parent genetic programs. Other criteria may also be employed.

In at least one embodiment of the invention, a separate Markov distribution and a separate Bayesian distribution may be maintained for recent transactions and for cumulative transactions, and the server 24 may combine the recent transaction and cumulative transaction distributions (e.g., when making genetic program generation decisions). During promotions, the server 24 may choose to weight the recent transaction distributions heavier than the cumulative transaction distributions (e.g., to increase the response time of the system to promotional offers).

The foregoing description discloses only exemplary embodiments of the invention, modifications of the above disclosed apparatus and method which fall within the scope of the

invention will be readily apparent to those of ordinary skill in the art. For instance, the process 400 and/or the process 600 initially may be run in the background at a store or restaurant to “train” the server 24. In this manner, the server 24 (via the process 400 and/or the process 600) may automatically learn the resource distributions and resource associations of the store/restaurant through observation using unsupervised learning methods. This may allow, for example, a system (e.g., the server 24, an upsell optimization system, etc.) to participate in an industrial domain, brand, or store/restaurant without prior knowledge representation. As transactions are observed, the performance increases correspondingly. This observation mode (or “self-learning” mode) may allow the system to capture transaction events and update the weights associated with a neural network until the system has been sufficiently trained. The system may then indicate that it is ready to operate and/or turn itself on.

Other factors may be employed during offer/rule generation. For example, either the process 400 or the process 600 may be employed to decide whether an item should be sold now or in the future (e.g., based on inventory considerations, based on the probability of the item selling later, based on replacement costs, based on one or more other business objectives such as generating the most profits, increasing customer traffic, having the best take rates, aligning offers with current promotions or advertising campaigns, promoting new products, reducing cashier and/or customer gaming, driving sales growth, increasing share holder/stock value, promoting offer deal values that are less than a dollar or more than a dollar, etc., based on various factors such as acceptance/take rate, average check information (e.g., to mitigate customer and/or cashier gaming), cashier information (e.g., how well a cashier makes offers) and/or based on any other goals, objectives or information).

Note that the genetic programming described herein may be employed to automatically create upsell optimization strategies evaluated by business attributes such as profitably and accept rate. Because this is independent of a particular retail sector, this knowledge can be shared universally with other implementations of the present invention operated in other domains (e.g., upsell optimization strategies developed in a QSR may be employed within other industries such as in other retail settings). Particular buying habits and tendencies may be ‘abstracted’ and used by other business segments. That is, genetic programs and processes from one business segment can be adapted to other business segments. For example, the process 400 and/or the process 600 could be used within a retail clothing store to aid cashiers/salespeople in making relevant recommendations to compliment

a given customer's initial selections. If a customer selected a shirt and pair of slacks, the system 20 might recommend a pair of socks, shoes, tie, sport coat, etc., depending upon the total purchase price of the 'base' items, time of day, day of week, customer ID, etc.

Thereafter, the genetic programs employed by the system 20 in the retail clothing setting can be used across industries (e.g., genetic programs may evolve over time into a more efficient application). Therefore, although a given set of rules may or may not apply in another industry a given 'program' may have generic usefulness in other retail segments when applied to new transactional data and/or rule sets (manually or genetically generated).

In some embodiments of the invention, unsupervised and reinforcement learning techniques may be combined to automatically learn associations between resources, and to automatically generate optimized strategies. For example, by disentangling a resource learning module from an upsell maximizing module, relevant, universal information may be shared across any retail outlet. Additionally, a reward can be specified dynamically with respect to time, and independently of a domain. Through the use of rewards (e.g., feedback), a "self-tuning" environment may be created, wherein successful transactions (offers), are propagated, while unsuccessful transactions are either discouraged and/or wither and die out. Note that rewards may also be provided to a cashier for successfully consummating an offer (e.g., if a customer accepts the reward), or for simply making offers (e.g., using voice technologies to track cashier compliance). The process 400 and/or the process 600 may be used to automatically determine (e.g., generally for all cashiers and/or specifically for individual cashiers) which incentive programs are most productive for motivating cashiers (e.g., either for a program as a whole or targeted incentives by transaction). For example, the present invention may be employed to determine that a cash based incentive for an entire team is more effective, on average, than individual incentives (or vice versa). However, it may also be determined that an additional individual incentive is particularly effective when the amount of sale exceeds a certain dollar amount (e.g. \$20.00).

In one or more embodiments, the present invention may be employed to automatically determine the various pricing levels within a retail outlet that has implemented a tiered pricing system, such as the tiered pricing system described in previously incorporated U.S. Patent No. 6,119,100. For example, the system 20 may be employed to determine the number (e.g., 2, 3... n), timing and levels of various pricing schemes. Based on consumer behaviors, the system 20 could become "self-tuning" using one or more of the methods described herein.

In at least one embodiment, the present invention may be employed to translate classifiers into “English” (or some other human-readable language). For example, humans (e.g., developers) may wish to understand the operation of the present invention by analyzing its processes and underlying assumptions (e.g., via the examination of classifiers). In this regard, a translation module (e.g., computer program code written in any computer language) may be employed that translates classifiers into a human readable form.

Accordingly, while the present invention has been disclosed in connection with the exemplary embodiments thereof, it should be understood that other embodiments may fall within the spirit and scope of the invention as defined by the following claims.

APPENDIX A

PURPOSE

This Appendix A describes the XCS Algorithm and offers a scheme for adopting it to optimize the Digital Deal rules.

OVERVIEW OF CLASSIFIER SYSTEMS

A classifier system is a machine learning system that uses “if-then” rules, called classifiers, to react to and learn about its environment. Machine learning means that the behavior of the system improves over time, through interaction with the environment. The basic idea is that good behavior is positively reinforced and bad behavior is negatively reinforced. The population of classifiers represents the system’s knowledge about the environment.

A classifier system generally has three parts: the performance system, the learning system and the rule discovery system. The performance system is responsible for reacting to the environment. When an input is received from the environment, the performance system searches the population of classifiers for a classifier whose “if” matches the input. When a match is found, the “then” of the matching classifier is returned to the environment. The environment performs the action indicated by the “then” and returns a scalar reward to the classifier system.

FIG. 7 generally illustrates one embodiment 700 of a classifier system.

One should note that the performance system is not adaptive; it just reacts to the environment. It is the job of the learning system to use the reward to reevaluate the usefulness of the matching classifier. Each classifier is assigned a strength that is a measure of how useful the classifier has been in the past. The system learns by modifying the measure of strength for each of its classifiers. When the environment sends a positive reward then the strength of the matching classifier is increased and vice versa.

This measure of strength is used for two purposes. When the system is presented with an input that matches more than one classifier in the population, the action of the classifier with the highest strength will be selected. The system has “learned” which classifiers are better. The other use of strength is employed by the classifier system’s third part, the rule discovery system. If the system does not try new actions on a regular basis then it will stagnate. The rule discovery system uses a simple genetic algorithm with the strength of the classifiers as the fitness function to select two classifiers to crossover and mutate to create two new and,

hopefully, better classifiers. Classifiers with a higher strength have a higher probability of being selected for reproduction.

OVERVIEW OF XCS

XCS is a kind of classifier system. There are two major differences between XCS and traditional classifier systems:

1. As mentioned above, each classifier has a strength parameter that measures how useful the classifier has been in the past. In traditional classifier systems, this strength parameter is commonly referred to as the predicted payoff and is the reward that the classifier expects to receive if its action is executed. The predicted payoff is used to select classifiers to return actions to the environment and also to select classifiers for reproduction. In XCS, the predicted payoff is also used to select classifiers for returning actions but it is not used to select classifiers for reproduction. To select classifiers for reproduction and for deletion, XCS uses a fitness measure that is based on the accuracy of the classifier's predictions. The advantage to this scheme is that since classifiers can exist in different environmental niches that have different payoff levels and if we just use predicted payoff to select classifiers for reproduction then our population will be dominated by classifiers from the niche with the highest payoff giving an inaccurate mapping of the solution space.
2. The other difference is that traditional classifier systems run the genetic algorithm on the entire population while XCS uses a niche genetic algorithm. During the course of the XCS algorithm, subsets of classifiers are created. All classifiers in the subsets have conditions that match a given input. The genetic algorithm is run on these smaller subsets. In addition, the classifiers that are selected for mutation are mutated in such a way so that after mutation the condition still matches the input.

XCS CLASSIFIERS

A Classifier is an “if-then” rule composed of 3 parts: the “if”, the “then” and some statistics. The “if” part of a classifier is called the condition and is represented by a ternary bitstring composed from the set $\{0, 1, \#\}$. The “#” is called a Don’t Care and can be matched to either a 1 or a 0. The “then” part of a classifier is called the action and is also a bitstring but it is composed from the set $\{0, 1\}$. There are a few more statistics (see table below) in addition to the Predicted Payoff and Fitness that were mentioned above.

Example of a Classifier:

0#011#01##000011#1 \Rightarrow 011010

The condition (the left-side of the arrow) could translate to something like “If its Thursday or Tuesday at noon and the order is a Big Mac and Soda.”

The action (the right-side of the arrow) could translate to something like “Offer an ice cream cone.”

CLASSIFIER MATCHING

It was stated above that the population of classifiers is searched for classifiers that match the input. How does a classifier match an input? First, the input from the environment (like Big Mac and Coke) is encoded as a string of 0’s and 1’s. A classifier is said to match an input if:

1. The condition length and input length are equal
2. For every bit in the condition, the bit is either a # or it is the same as the corresponding bit in the input. For example, if the input is “Thursday, noon, Big Mac, Soda” then there might be a classifier that has a Don’t Care for the day of the week. If there is such a classifier then it would match the input if it also has “noon, Big Mac, Soda” in the condition.

Example of Matching:

Let the input from the environment be:

I: 001010011 (Could mean something like: Thursday, 1:00 pm, Cashier 2, Store 10, 2 Big Macs, 1 Large Coke)

Let the population of classifiers be:

C1: 01##110## \Rightarrow 0110

C2: #010#001# \Rightarrow 1000

C3: 0#1#100## \Rightarrow 0111

C4: 0#111#0#0 \Rightarrow 0110

C5: 00#1000#0 \Rightarrow 0010

C6: 0##0100## \Rightarrow 0001

I matches C2, C3, C6.

CLASSIFIER STATISTICS

The following table 1 lists the statistics that each classifier keeps along with the algorithm for updating the statistics after a reward has been received from the environment.

| STATISTIC | DESCRIPTION | UPDATE ALGORITHM Let L be the Learning Rate Let R be the Reward received The "If (experience < 1/L)" is the implementation of the MAM technique |
|-------------------|---|---|
| Prediction | Keeps an average of the expected payoff if the classifier matches the input and its action is taken. Note that fitness is used to select classifiers for reproduction only. Prediction is used to define which is the "best" classifier. | If (experience $\leq 1/L$) $\text{pred} = (\text{pred} * \text{experience} + R) / (\text{experience} + 1)$ Else $\text{pred} = \text{pred} + L * (R - \text{pred})$ |
| Error | Estimates the errors made in the prediction. | If (experience $\leq 1/L$) $\text{error} = (\text{error} * \text{experience} + (R - \text{pred} / \text{paymentRange})) / (\text{experience} + 1)$ Else $\text{error} = \text{error} + (L * ((R - \text{pred} / \text{paymentRange}) - \text{error}))$ |
| Fitness | The fitness of the classifier is based on the accuracy of the classifier's predictions. Note that fitness increases as error decreases. Note | First, calculate the total accuracy for all classifiers in the action set. TotalAccuracy TA = $\sum_{c \text{ in Action Set}} (\text{numerosity}_c * \text{Accuracy}_c)$ |

| | | |
|------------------------|---|---|
| | that fitness is used to select classifiers for reproduction only. Prediction is used to define which is the “best” classifier. | Second, compute relative accuracy, RA. $RA = (accuracy * numerosity) / TA$ Then, compute fitness. $fitness = fitness + L * (RA - fitness)$ |
| Experience | The number of times since its creation that a classifier has belonged to an action set. | Increment By 1 |
| GA Iteration | Denotes the time-step of the last occurrence of a GA in an action set to which this classifier belonged. | Set to current iteration |
| Action Set Size | Estimates the average size of the action sets this classifier has belonged to. Updates to this are independent of updates to fitness, error and prediction. | If (experience $\leq 1/L$) size = size + $(\sum_{c \text{ in Action Set}} numerosity_c - size) /$ experience Else size = size + $L * (\sum_{c \text{ in Action Set}} numerosity_c - size)$ |
| Numerosity | Is the number of microclassifiers that are represented by this classifier. | Incremented when a classifier subsumes another classifier and when an identical classifier is created. Decremented when a classifier is deleted from the population. If numerosity equals 0 then the classifier is deleted from the population. |
| Accuracy | This is a measure of how accurate a classifier’s predictions are. This can be computed from error so it does not need to be stored. | Let E be the minimum error If (error $\leq E$) Accuracy = 1.0 Else Accuracy = $e^{((\ln(fallOffRate) * (error - E) / E)) * fallOffRate}$ Note: fallOffRate $< 1 \Rightarrow \ln(fallOffRate) < 0$ error $> E \Rightarrow error - E > 0$ e raised to a negative power is a number in (0,1) so Accuracy becomes some number between (0,1) |

TABLE 1

INPUT COVERING – GENERATION OF MATCHING CLASSIFIERS

When an input is received, the population of classifiers is searched and all matching classifiers are put in a set called the Condition Match Set. If the size of the Condition Match Set is less than some number N then the input is not covered. The number N is known, appropriately enough, as the Minimum Match Set Size and is a parameter of the system. To cover an input, matching classifiers are created and inserted into the population.

The algorithm for creating matching classifiers is as follows:

1. Initialize the classifier, CL, so that its condition identically matches the input.
2. For each bit in CL: Generate a random number, R , in $[0,1]$. If $(R < \text{Covering Probability})$ then change the bit to a '#'. Covering Probability is also a parameter of the system.
3. Generate a random action that is not present in the Condition Match Set.
4. Set the prediction equal to the mean prediction of all classifiers in the population.
5. Set the error equal to the mean error of all classifiers in the population.
6. Set the fitness equal to the $0.1 * \text{mean fitness of all classifiers in the population}$.
7. Set the experience equal to 0
8. Set the GA iteration equal to the current iteration.
9. Set the action set size equal to the mean action set size.
10. Set the numerosity equal to 1
11. Insert CL into the population and into the Condition Match Set

DIGITAL DEAL CLASSIFIERS

Digital Deal classifiers are just like regular XCS classifiers except that they have special requirements for matching, covering and random action generation. Both the condition and action contain Menu Item Ids. These are used to look up the item in the Digital Deal menu item database in order to get pricing and cost information. The Digital Deal classifiers are stored in the DPUM database.

CONDITION

The condition in a Digital Deal classifier is 3 64 bit chunks for the environment and 6 128-bit chunks for the food items. The environment contains things like day-of-week, time-of-day, cashier id, store id, etc. Calling the right-most bit the 0th bit, the following table 2A defines the bit locations of each field in the environment:

| Bits | Field | Len |
|-----------|---|-----|
| 0 – 32 | Destination ID from DPUM database | 33* |
| 33 – 44 | Month (Jan => 1, Feb => 2, Mar=>4, etc) of Order | 12 |
| 45 – 49 | Time of Order – Hour | 5 |
| 64 – 96 | Period ID from DPUM database | 33* |
| 97 – 103 | Day Of Week (Sunday => 1, Monday => 2, Tuesday => 4, etc) | 7 |
| 128 – 159 | Register ID from DPUM database | 32 |
| 160 – 191 | Cashier ID from DPUM database | 32 |

* MSB is the sign bit, if set then the quantity in the remaining bits is negative

TABLE 2A

Each of the next 6 128-bit chunks defines a menu item. Calling the right-most bit the 0th bit, the following chart defines the bit locations of each property of a menu item:

| Bits | Property Name | Len |
|---------|------------------------------|-----|
| 0 – 11 | Menu Item Type | 12 |
| 12 – 23 | Size | 12 |
| 24 – 35 | Temperature | 12 |
| 36 | Pre-packaged | 1 |
| 37 | Discounted | 1 |
| 38 – 43 | Time Of Day Available | 6 |
| 64-127 | Specific Properties for Type | 64 |

The exact values for the Property Name column are defined in Appendix A-2.

TABLE 2B

ACTION

An action has a variable length. The length depends on the type of action and the length of the binary descriptions of the menu items in the action. The shortest possible length of an action is 3 * 64 bits and the length will always be a multiple of 3.

An action is composed of groups of 3 64-bit chunks. The first chunk contains the 32-bit Menu Item Id from the DPUM database and the next 128-bits contain the binary description of that menu item. If the item is a meal then it will need more than one 128-bit chunk for the description so append the additional 128-bit description with a pad of 64 0's between each 128-bit description.

If the action is a Replace then the first Menu Item Id is the Id of the item to replace and the second Menu Item Id is the Id of the offer. If the action is an Add then there will only be one Menu Item Id in the action. Additionally, the MSB of the first 64-bit chunk will be set if the action is a Replace.

DIGITAL DEAL CLASSIFIER MATCHING

Before an order is sent to the XCS system, it is broken up into separate meals. Exactly how the order is broken up is discussed later but here is an example: Let the order be 1 Big Mac, 1 Hamburger, 2 Large Fries, 1 Coke, 1 Apple Pie then the possible meals are M1 = (Big Mac, Large Fries, Coke, null, null, null) and M2 = (Hamburger, Large Fries, Apple Pie, null, null, null). A meal contains 6 menu items. Some of the menu items may be null. A menu item belongs to one of 6 classes: main, side, beverage, dessert, miscellaneous, topping/condiment. A meal may have more than one kind of menu item in it (e.g., it is ok for a meal to have 2 sides). The input that we are matching against is actually a meal and not an entire order.

With all of that in mind, for a classifier, C, to match a given input, I, then all of the following must be true:

1. The environments of I and C must match. The first 192 bits of C and of I are the environment. Use traditional bit-by-bit matching to match the two environments .
2. Use traditional bit-by-bit matching to match the menu items. For each menu item in the input, there must be a matching menu item in the classifier. Order does not matter. The first item in the input can match, say, the third item in the classifier.

3. The action must match the input. For example, if the input is “Big Mac and Soda” then the action cannot be “Replace the small coffee with a large coffee.”
4. The amount of change must be less than the price of the offer. For example, if the total price of the order is \$2.01 then the change is \$0.99 and if the price of the offer in the action is \$0.50 then this is not a match. This classifier could have been created for an order with a total price of something like \$2.60 so that the action with a price of \$.50 made more sense.

DIGITAL DEAL RANDOM ACTION GENERATION

The process of generating random Digital Deal actions may seem like a trivial task but is quite complicated. The chief culprit is the desire for the random actions to be very random. By “very” random, I mean that the search space of all possible actions is quite large so the random actions should cover as much of it as possible. The other major problem is that the random actions are subject to a whole slew of constraints. The actions generated should be profitable to both the store and the customer. For example, an offer that is not profitable to the store is “For your change of \$0.05, add 20 Big Macs” and an offer that is not profitable to the customer is “For your change of \$0.30, you can replace your Super-Size soda with a small Soda.” Remember that the order is broken up into meals so random actions are generated per meal.

The following is a step-by-step explanation of how random actions can be generated.

1. Let TP be the total price of the entire order (not just the meal).
2. Let T be the time of day that the offer is valid (e.g., the Period ID of the order).
3. Initialize O, the set of possible offers, to the empty set.
4. With equal probability, randomly decide if the offer will be a replace or an add.
5. If the offer is a replace then randomly pick something from the meal to replace. The item can be replaced if it’s parent item is null and it’s min and max price are > 0 .
6. Let TP_{round} be TP rounded up to the next dollar.
7. Compute the amount of change available by subtracting TP from TP_{round} .
8. If the offer is an add then add all menu items that satisfy the following to O: the item is for the presently described embodiment of the invention, the min price is less than the change, the max price is greater than the change and the item is available in time period T. If the offer is a replace then add all menu items that satisfy the following to

O: the item is for the presently described embodiment of the invention, the price of the item is greater than the price of the replaced item, the (min price – min price of replaced) is less than the change, the (max price - max price of replaced) is greater than the change and the item is available in time period T. For a replace, we have to check both price and max price since the max price of an item may be 0 if it is not available as an offer.

9. If the size of the set O generated in Step 8 is less than half the size of the minimum match set size (M) then add \$1 to the change and return to Step 8 to try to add more items to O. By making the size of the offer pool greater than M, as opposed to just greater than 0, we are guaranteed to have more random actions.
10. If the set O is not empty then randomly select one of the items and return it. If the set is empty and the offer is a replace then switch the offer to an add and go to step 8. If the set is empty and the offer is an add then return null; no offer will be generated for this order.

XCS SYSTEM PARAMETERS

The following TABLE 3 lists the system parameters for the XCS algorithm. An application with a graphical interface may be built to allow an expert user to change these parameters. The given defaults are the defaults recommended by the designer of the XCS algorithm (see Wilson 1995 referenced above).

| PARAMETER | DESCRIPTION | COMMON SETTING | DEFAULT |
|---------------------------|---|--|---------|
| Population Size | Number of classifiers in the system | This should be large enough so that covering only occurs at the very beginning of a run. | 5000 |
| Action Space Size | The number of possible actions in the system. | It must be greater than the minimum match set size. | 85 |
| Initial Prediction | The initial classifier prediction value used when a classifier is created through covering. | Very small in proportion to the maximum reward. For a maximum reward of 1000, a good value for this is 10. | 10 |
| Initial Fitness | The initial classifier fitness value used when a classifier is created through covering. | 0.01 | 0.01 |
| Initial | The initial classifier accuracy | 0.01 | 0.01 |

| | | | |
|--------------------------------|--|---|------|
| Accuracy | value used when a classifier is created through covering. | | |
| Initial Error | The initial classifier error value used when a classifier is created through covering. | Should be small | 0 |
| Crossover Probability | The probability of crossover within the GA | Range of 0.5 - 1.0 | 0.8 |
| Mutation Probability | The likelihood of a bit being mutated | Range of 0.01 – 0.05 | 0.04 |
| Minimum Match Set Size | The minimal number of classifiers in the match set that must be present or covering will take place | To cause covering to provide classifiers for every action then set this equal to the number of available actions. | 10 |
| GA Threshold | The GA is applied in a set when the average time since the last GA is greater than this threshold. Each classifier keeps track of a time stamp that indicates the last time that a GA was run on an action set that it belonged to. The time stamp is in units of “steps.” | Range 25 – 50 | 25 |
| Covering Probability | The probability of using a ‘#’ symbol in a bit during covering. | 0.33 | 0.33 |
| Learning Rate | The learning rate for Prediction, Error and Fitness. Used to implement the MAM technique. | 0.1 – 0.2 | 0.2 |
| Deletion Threshold | If the experience of a classifier is greater than this then the fitness of the classifier may be considered in its probability of deletion. | 20 | 20 |
| Exploration Probability | The probability that during action selection the action will be chosen randomly. | 0.5 | 0.5 |
| Minimum Error | The error below which classifiers are considered to have equal accuracy. Used to update the fitness. | 0.01 | 0.01 |

| | | | |
|------------------------------------|--|------|------|
| Fall Off Rate | Used to update the accuracy | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Subsumption Threshold | The experience of a classifier must be greater than this in order to be able to subsume another classifier. | 20 | 20 |
| Mean Fitness Fraction | Specifies the mean fitness in the population below which the fitness of a classifier may be considered in its probability of deletion. | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Minimum Reward | The reward for a bad action. | 0 | 0 |
| Maximum Reward | The reward for a good action. | 1000 | 1000 |
| Action Set Subsumption Flag | Action Set Subsumption can be turned on/off by toggling this flag. | True | True |
| GA Subsumption Flag | GA Subsumption can be turned on/off by toggling this flag. | True | True |

TABLE 3

SINGLE-STEP XCS ALGORITHM

1. Let O be the order (For example, 1 KFC Meal (Chicken Leg, Cole Slaw, Beans), 1 Chicken Sandwich, 1 Soda, and an Apple Pie). Let C be the population of classifiers.
2. Break O into meals $M_1, M_2, M_3, \dots, M_N$
 - a. Shuffle the order of the items in the order
 - b. For each item in the order, find the item in the Menu Item table. If the item cannot be found and the item's parent is null then reject the entire order and return no offer. If the item cannot be found but it's parent is non-null then just skip the item. If the item is of type Meal (like a Extra Value Meal) then add it to a unique M_i . If the item is not of type Meal then place it into a separate list. After all the items in the order have been inspected, scroll through the list of single type items and add those to the recently created M_i or create new M_i .

For the example order above the possible meals are:

M_1 = Chicken Leg, Cole Slaw, Beans, Apple Pie, null, null

M_2 = Chicken Sandwich, Soda, null, null, null

3. For each Meal in the order, generate Condition Match Sets. Create a Condition Match Set by searching through the population for any classifiers that match the given Meal.
4. If the size of any Condition Match Set is less than the Minimum Match Set Size then cover the Meal. See the sections on Classifiers and Digital Deal Classifiers for an explanation of covering.
5. For all the Condition Match Sets, create a Prediction Array. The Prediction Array stores the predicted payoff for each possible action in the system. The predicted payoff is a fitness-weighted average of the predictions of all classifiers in the Condition Match Set that advocate the action. The formula for calculating the fitness-weighted averages is: Let AS be the set of classifiers from the Condition Match Set with the same action, A. Then the Predicted Payoff, P, of A is:

$$P = \left(\sum_{c \in AS} \text{Prediction}_c * \text{Fitness}_c \right) / \sum_{c \in AS} \text{Fitness}_c$$
6. If possible, choose 2 actions. The actions can be either a random selection (exploration) or based upon the Prediction Array (exploitation). If exploration then choose 2 random actions. If exploitation then choose the 2 best actions. The best action is defined to be the action with the highest prediction. If the highest prediction is shared by two or more actions then randomly choose an action.
7. Create an Action Set for each chosen action. The Action Set is the set of classifiers from the Condition Match Set that have actions that match the chosen action. The Genetic Algorithm is run only on the Action Set.
8. Return the actions to the environment. The amount of the reward is based on whether the offer was rejected or accepted. The reward is 0 if the offer was rejected. If the offer was accepted then the amount of the award is $(1 - \text{minPrice of offer/change in order}) * 100$ rounded to the nearest integer and then divided by 10. This gives rewards in the set {1000, 1100, 1200, ..., 2000}. This reward scheme gives accepted offers with bigger profits a higher reward. Since two offers are returned, the accepted offer is given a positive reward while the other offer is given a negative reward.
9. Using the reward, update all the statistics of the classifiers that are part of Action Set. The statistics are modified in the following order: experience, action set size prediction, error, accuracy and fitness. Changing the order of the modifications will change the rate at which the system learns. For example, if prediction comes before error then the prediction of a classifier in its very first update immediately predicts the

correct payoff and consequently the prediction error is set to 0. This can lead to faster learning in simple processes but can be misleading in more complex problems. The algorithms for updating the statistics are given in a table above. Do Action Set Subsumption if it is enabled. In Action Set Subsumption, the Action Set is searched for the most general classifier that is both accurate and sufficiently experienced. All other classifiers in the set are tested against this general one to see if it subsumes them. Any classifiers that are subsumed are removed from the population. Example: Let the Action Set be: C1: 011#110## → 0111 C2: #010#001# → 0111 C3: 0#1#1#0## → 0111 C4: 0#111#0#0 → 0111. C3 is the most general since it has the most #'s. It is more general than C1 and C4. It is not more general than C2 since C2 has a '#' in the first position and C3 does not. If C3 is accurate and sufficiently experienced then we could subsume C1 & C4 by removing them from the population and increasing the numerosity of C3 by 2.

11. Run the Genetic Algorithm (GA) if the Action Set indicates that we should. The GA will be run on the Action Set if the average time since the last GA in the set is greater than the GA threshold. Average time, AT, is computed as follows:

$$AT = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \text{GA iteration}_{ci} * \text{numerosity}_{ci}}{\sum_{i=1}^n \text{numerosity}_{ci}}$$

where the \sum is over the Action Set. To run the GA, use Roulette Wheel Selection to select two parents from the Action Set. By using Roulette Wheel selection, the classifiers with the highest accuracy tend to reproduce most often. Using the probability of crossover, the parents are crossed. If the parents are crossed then the prediction values of the offspring are set to the average of the prediction values of the parents. Notice that crossover only takes place in the condition and not in the action. Next, mutate the two offspring. Mutation takes place in both the action and the condition. XCS uses a restricted version of mutation that only allows a bit of the condition to be mutated if it is changed to a '#' or to a value that matches the given input. This results in an offspring with a condition that still matches the input. Actions are mutated as a whole (e.g., actions are mutated into a randomly generated new action).

Now that we have two new offspring, check if its parent subsumes either offspring. The parent must have an experience level greater than the Subsumption Threshold and must be accurate (accuracy of 1.0). If the offspring is subsumed then do not insert it into the population, just increment the numerosity of the parent. If the offspring is not

subsumed then it is inserted to the population. If the size of the population is greater than the maximum size then a classifier has to be selected for deletion. XCS uses Roulette Wheel Selection to select a classifier for deletion.

ORGANIZATION OF THE SOFTWARE

The code is organized into two parts: the Classifier System and Digital Deal Classifier. The Classifier System is a black box that receives a vector of bitstrings, runs the XCS algorithm on them, produces an action and receives rewards. It knows nothing about Digital Deal, QSR, Big Macs, upsells, etc. The Classifier System contains an abstract object called Classifier. When the Classifier System is created, it is passed the name of a classifier class. This classifier class encapsulates all of the peculiarities of the problem at hand. Through the power of inheritance, the Classifier System black box can manipulate Digital Deal classifiers or any other kind of classifier. The Digital Deal Classifier module supplies all the special routines for matching and generating random actions that were discussed above.

CLASSIFIER SYSTEM

SystemParameters

Each environment must create a SystemParameters class using the function *SystemParameters.createSystemParameters*. This function verifies that the parameters are valid and then creates and returns a reference to a SystemParameters class. If the parameters are invalid then an exception is thrown. This function takes a String argument. If the argument is null then the default system parameters are used. If the argument is not null then it must be the name of a SystemParameters class. A reference to the parameters class is passed to the ClassifierSystem when it is created. To change the defaults:

1. Derive a SystemParameters class from SystemParameters. Implement the function *localDefaultValues* to add new defaults values.
2. Pass the name of this new class to the function *SystemParameters.createSystemParameters*.

Additional parameters can be added in a similar way.

BitString

A BitString is a class containing an array of longs. In Java, longs are 64-bits long. When a BitString is created with just a length then:

1. Figure out how many 64-bit chunks are needed to contain that length. Example if length=65 then 2 64-bit chunks are needed.
2. Initialize the array of longs to have a length equal to the number of chunks that was computed in 1.
3. Initialize each element of the array to 0.

When a BitString is created with a String argument then:

1. Do the same as above using length = string length.
2. If the i-th character of the string is a '1' then figure out which bit in which chunk maps to i and set it to a 1. The mapping is from 1-Dimension to 2-Dimensions and is given in TABLE 4 below.

| String Index | Array Index | Bit of Long |
|--------------|-------------|--------------|
| 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 63 | 0 | 63 |
| 64 | 1 | 0 |
| 127 | 1 | 63 |
| 128 | 2 | 0 |
| i | $i / 64$ | $i \bmod 64$ |

TABLE 4

Each classifier is composed of two BitStrings, the condition and the action. The BitString class provides functions for creating BitStrings, for testing if two BitStrings are equal, for cloning a BitString, for accessing bits from a BitString and for modifying the bits of a BitString.

ConditionBitString

The ConditionBitString class is derived from the BitString class. This class has an additional array of longs which functions as a Don't Care mask. If any bit in the Don't Care mask is set then the corresponding bit in the original array is a Don't Care bit. The ConditionBitString class provides functions for determining if two ConditionBitStrings match. Using a series of exclusive-or operations tests matching.

Classifier

A Classifier is an abstract class. In order to use the XCS package, one must derive a Classifier class from this parent. Implementations for the functions *localInit* and *clone* must be provided. When the ClassifierSystem is created, it is given the name of the derived Classifier class so that any Classifiers that are created in the ClassifierSystem will be of the derived type.

A Classifier has three parts: a condition, an action and some statistics. Both the condition and action are BitStrings. A Classifier has two constructors: the public constructor is used to create a Classifier with an empty condition and empty action. The function *fillClassifier* must be used to actually set the condition and action. The private constructor is only used to clone an existing Classifier. Functions are provided to mutate, crossover, test for equality, test for matching, modify the statistics, and read the statistics.

ClassifierStatistics

The ClassifierStatistics class encapsulates all of the classifier statistics. Functions are provided for accessing and modifying the statistics. The algorithms for updating the statistics are described in detail in the table found in the XCS Classifier Statistics section.

ClassifierSystem

The only interface with the outside world is through the ClassifierSystem class. One can create a ClassifierSystem, give an input to the system, receive an output from the system, give a reward to the system and query the system for the current classifier population. When a ClassifierSystem is created, it is given the name of the Classifier class to use when creating new classifiers and is given the system parameters to use in the execution of the XCS algorithm.

ClassifierPopulation

The ClassifierPopulation class contains the collection of classifiers that the XCS algorithm uses. Functions exist for inserting and deleting classifiers and for searching the population for classifiers that match an input.

ConditionMatchSet

The ConditionMatchSet class is used to create Condition Match Sets. A Condition Match Set is a collection of classifiers from the population whose condition matches a given input string. For traditional XCS classifiers, a classifier is said to "match" an input string if: 1. Condition length and input length are equal 2. For every bit in the condition, the bit is either a

or it is the same as the corresponding bit in the input. Matching for Digital Deal classifiers is much more complicated. A Condition Match Set is said to "cover" an input if the number of classifiers in the match set is at least equal to some minimum number. Functions exist for creating the prediction array from the match set, for enumerating the match set and to test if the match set covers an input.

PredictionArray

The prediction array stores the predicted payoff for each possible action in the system. The predicted payoff is a fitness-weighted average of the predictions of all classifiers in the condition match set that advocate the action. If no classifiers in the match set advocate the action then the prediction is NULL. Ideally, the prediction array is an array with a spot for each possible action. For our system, the number of possible actions is too big so we will only add actions for which a classifier advocating that action exists. Functions exist for creating a PredictionArray from a ConditionMatchSet, for returning the best action based on predicted payoff and for returning a random action. The fitness-weighted average is computed as follows:

1. For a given action, compute the weighted prediction. The weighted prediction is the sum of the prediction * fitness for each classifier advocating that action.
2. For a given action, compute the total fitness. The total fitness is the sum of the fitness for each classifier advocating that action.
3. The fitness-weighted average for an action is the weighted prediction / total fitness.

ActionSet

During the course of the XCS algorithm, an action is selected from all the possible actions specified in the Condition Match Sets. The ActionSet class contains the set of classifiers from the Condition Match Set that have actions that match the selected action. The GA is run only on the ActionSet. For each iteration of the XCS algorithm, a new ActionSet is formed. If the size of the Action Set is greater than one then action set subsumption takes place. In action set subsumption, the Action Set is searched for the most general classifier that is both accurate and sufficiently experienced. If such a classifier is found then all the other classifiers in the set are tested against this general one to see if it subsumes them. Any classifiers that are subsumed are removed from the population. Setting the subsumption flag in the system parameters to false can disable action set subsumption. Since the GA is run on the Action Set, it is not obvious how this algorithm can be used with

historical data. Functions are included for updating all of the classifier statistics, doing action set subsumption, and running the genetic algorithm.

XCSexception

This class is the exception class for the XCS algorithm. This exception is thrown when functions to implement the XCS algorithm are used incorrectly. For example, an XCSexception is thrown if one attempts to update the prediction before updating the experience.

DIGITAL DEAL CLASSIFIER

The Digital DealClassifier class is derived from the abstract class Classifier. As stated earlier, Digital Deal classifiers have special requirements for generating matching classifiers, generating random actions and checking for matching classifiers. This class provides all of the special functionality. When the ClassifierSystem is created then pass the name of this class to it.

INITIAL DIGITAL DEAL CLASSIFIER POPULATION

Since XCS is capable of generating classifiers, it can start with an empty population. However, the learning process is much quicker if XCS is given some knowledge with which to start. Since Digital Deal works well, it seems logical to seed the classifier population with the Digital Deal rules. The Initial Rule Generator application extracts the Digital Deal rules from the historical order and offer data. The application can be run from the Start Menu by choosing DPUM>BioNET Initial Rule Generator.

The BioNET.properties file is a flat property file that is used to configure the behavior of the application. The properties file can be found in c:\Program Files\DRS\DPUM\BioNET and can be edited with any editor. An explanation of the fields in the property file is given later.

ALGORITHM DESIGN

The following is a step-by-step explanation of the extraction and translation process.

1. Create the following tables in the database: The ClassifierCondition table has fields: Condition, Don't Care, Action Type, Experience, Action Set Size, Prediction, Fitness, Numerosity, Accuracy, Error, GA Iteration, The ClassifierAction table has fields for the action. The ConditionAction table is the link table to link the condition and action.
2. Perform the following query to extract the orders from the order table:
SELECT OrderTable.OrderID, OfferItem.Replace, OrderTable.DestinationID, OrderTable.PeriodID, OrderTable.RegisterID, OrderTable.CashierID,

OrderTable.DTStamp, OrderTable.Total, OrderItem.MenuItemID, OrderItem.Price, OrderItem.Quantity, OfferItem.MenuItemID, OfferItem.Quantity, OfferItem.OfferPrice, OrderItem.DPUMItem, OrderItem.ParentItemID, OfferItem.ReplaceMenuItemID FROM (OrderItem INNER JOIN OrderTable ON OrderItem.OrderID = OrderTable.OrderID) INNER JOIN OfferItem ON OrderTable.OrderID = OfferItem.OrderID WHERE (((OrderTable.OrderStatusID)=4) AND ((OfferItem.AcceptStatusID)=1) AND ((OrderItem.Deleted)=0)) AND (OrderTable.DTStamp IS NOT NULL) ORDER BY OrderTable.DTStamp DESC

3. Using the first 10000 rows of the query result set, create QSRorder objects from all rows with the same Order ID.
4. Translate each QSRorder into 1 or more classifiers.
5. Add each classifier to a classifier population
6. For each classifier in the population, add Don't Cares to the condition.
7. For each classifier in the population, set the statistics to the default values.
8. Write the classifier population to the database.

MODIFYING THE RUN-TIME BEHAVIOR OF THE INITIAL RULE GENERATOR

The InitialRules application has a property file that is used to modify its run-time behavior.

The following TABLE 5 is an explanation of the properties in the file.

| Property Name | Description | Example |
|---------------|---|------------------------------|
| jdbc.drivers | Contains a list of class names for the database drivers. We are using the jdbc-odbc bridge so what is shown in the example is always valid. | sun.jdbc.odbc.JdbcOdbcDriver |
| jdbc.url | URL of the database to connect to. Since we are using the JDBC-ODBC bridge, the URL will start with "jdbc:odbc" and the last part must be set with the ODBC Data Sources tool in the Control Panel. | jdbc:odbc:McDs |

| | | |
|---------------------|--|----|
| jdbc.username | Login ID of the user to log into the database | sa |
| jdbc.password | Password needed to log the user into the database | |
| closedOrderStatusId | Value in the OrderStatusID column of the OrderTable table that indicates a closed order. | 4 |
| acceptStatusId | Value in the AcceptStatusID column of the OfferItem table that indicates an accepted offer. | 1 |
| numerosityMin | The minimum number of duplicates needed for a rule generated from an order to be written to the database. For example, if set to a 1 then every order will be translated to a rule and written to the database. If set to a 2 then the order must appear at least twice. | 4 |
| printClassifiers | Set to a 1 if you want the rules written to standard output as they are written to the database. Set to 0 otherwise. | 0 |
| printOrders | Set to a 1 if you want the orders written to standard output as they are found. Set to a 0 otherwise. | 0 |

TABLE 5

Properties are entered into the property file by typing `propertyName=value`. There should be no spaces between the name, =, and value. Notice that when a path and file name is given, the path can use forward slashes (/) or backward slashes (\) but when backward slashes are used they must be doubled. Java is case-sensitive so be careful.

TRANSLATING DIGITAL DEAL CLASSIFIERS TO ENGLISH

Using the Translation application, Digital Deal classifiers can be translated to English. Each classifier is translated to a string with each field delimited with the delimiter of your choice. The translation can then be exported to Excel or any other spreadsheet.

The Translator translates the Digital Deal classifiers into 3 different forms: a paragraph form, a parsed one-line form and into English. By far, the English version is the most useful but the other two forms are good for debugging.

The paragraph form parses each field (day of week, cashier id, etc) of the classifier onto a separate line. The following is an example of one classifier translated into paragraph form:

-----CONDITION-----

-----ENVIRONMENT-----

Day of Week: 10#0#00

Period ID: 000#####000#00000##00#####000000#0

Month: 00000000100#

Time of Day - Hour: ##001

Cashier ID: 00#000000##0##000000000##0#####0

Register ID: 000#000000000000#00000##0#00001##

Destination ID: 0000###0#00#0#0###0##000000#0#0##

-----ITEM 1-----

Type: 0000#00###00

Size: 000000000010

Time of Day Available: #00110

Discounted: 0

Prepackaged: 0

Temperature: ####000##001

Side: 0000##00##00000#0##0##0#0#0000000001##00000#00###00###00#00#0000

-----ITEM 2-----

Type: 0000##0000##

Size: 0###000##000

Time of Day Available: 00#000

Discounted: 0

Prepackaged: #

Temperature: 0#000##00000

Empty-Item: ##00#0#000#0000#000###0#0#00#000#0000##0000000#0##000#000#0#000

-----ITEM 3-----

Type: 000000#00##0

Size: 000000###0#0

Time of Day Available: 000000

Discounted: #

Prepackaged: 0

Temperature: ##000#0000##

Empty-Item: 00000#0000000000000000#000000000###0000000###0##0#000#00#000####

-----ITEM 4-----

Type: 00#00##0###0

Size: 0000000000##

Time of Day Available: #0##00

Discounted: 0

Prepackaged: 0

Temperature: 000#0####00#

Empty-Item: 0000000000#0#0#000##000000#000##000##00##0000#000000#00##0####00#

-----ITEM 5-----

Type: 0##00##0##0#

Size: 00000#000#0#

Time of Day Available: 00#00#

Discounted: 0

Prepackaged: 0

Temperature: 0#0000000###

Empty-Item: 000#0#00#00000000##0#0000#00##00#0###000#000000##00#00#0#0#00#00

-----ITEM 6-----

Type: 0#0#000000##

Size: #0##0000#0##

Time of Day Available: 0#0000

Discounted: 0

Prepackaged: 0

Temperature: 000#00000000

Empty-Item: #0000#0#000000000#0#00#####0#000#00#0000000#000#00#00#0##0000#00

-----ACTION-----

Action-Type: REPLACE

-----REPLACED ITEM-----

-----ITEM 1-----

Menu Item Id: 11

Type: 000000000100

Size: 000000000010

Time of Day Available: 000110

Discounted: 0

Prepackaged: 0